

CRYPTANALYSIS OF AN IDENTITY-BASED AUTHENTICATED KEY EXCHANGE PROTOCOL

YOUNES HATRI, AYOUB OTMANI, AND KENZA GUENDA

Abstract

Authenticated Key Exchange (AKE) protocols represent an important cryptographic mechanism that enables several parties to communicate securely over an open network. Elashry, Mu and Susilo proposed in 2015 an Identity Based Authenticated Key Exchange (IBAKE) protocol where different parties establish secure communication by means of their public identities. The authors also introduced a new security notion for IBAKE protocols called resiliency, that is, if a shared secret between a group of parties is compromised or leaked, they can generate another completely new shared secret without the need to set up a new key exchange session. They then proved that their IBAKE protocol satisfies this security notion.

We analyze the security of their protocol and prove that it has a major security flaw which renders it insecure against an impersonation attack. We also disprove the resiliency property of their scheme by proposing an attack where an adversary can compute any share secret key if just one secret bit is leaked.

1. INTRODUCTION

Key establishment protocols enable two or more entities to share a common key which can then be used for encrypting communications over an open network, or ensuring data integrity during the transport. The Diffie-Hellman key agreement protocol [DH76] is the first practical solution to the key distribution problem, allowing two parties to establish a shared secret over an open channel. However, it suffers from man-in-the-middle attacks because it does not authenticate the involved parties. A key agreement protocol is said to provide key authentication if each entity involved in the exchange is assured that no other entity can learn the shared secret key. A key agreement protocol which provides such a property is called an authenticated key agreement protocol (AKE). There exist several techniques to distribute authenticated keys. Classically it requires public-key certificates with public key infrastructures. Another very interesting approach is to use public data like identities to generate authenticated keys.

The idea of using identities in cryptography dates back to Shamir's paper [Sha85] where he defined the notion of identity based encryption (IBE) where he asks how to achieve an asymmetric encryption scheme that allows to compute public keys from arbitrary strings like user's identity (an email, phone number, *etc*). Consequently, electronic certificates are no more required

hatri.younes@hotmail.fr. Université des Sciences et de la Technologie Houari Boumediene, Bab Ezzouar 16111, Algeria.

ayoub.otmani@univ-rouen.fr. Normandie Univ, France; UR, LITIS, F-76821 Mont-Saint-Aignan, France.

ken.guenda@gmail.fr. Université des Sciences et de la Technologie Houari Boumediene, Bab Ezzouar 16111, Algeria.

and more importantly it eliminates the need for large-scale public key infrastructure. Although Shamir introduced this concept in [Sha85], he was not able to propose an IBE scheme. The construction of an IBE scheme remained an open problem until Boneh and Franklin [BF01] and Cocks [Coc01] proposed ones in 2001. The Boneh-Franklin scheme [BF01] makes use of bilinear maps which then sparked a large number of works [BB04, Wat05]. More recently, lattices were considered for constructing IBE schemes [GPV08] which gave rise to a large number of follow-up works.

The approach proposed by Cocks in [Coc01] builds an elegant IBE scheme based on the standard quadratic residuosity (QR) problem modulo an RSA composite N (in the random oracle model). It is time-efficient compared with pairing-based IBE systems, but unfortunately ciphertexts are very long. Boneh, Gentry and Hamburg (BGH) solved the problem of Cocks' scheme by presenting a space-efficient scheme without pairings but at the cost of a less time-efficient scheme [BGH07].

The concept of IBE was extended to authenticated key exchange (AKE) protocols. Smart [Sma01] presented a two-pass Identity-Based AKE (IBAKE) using Weil pairings and merging the ideas of Boneh and Franklin [BF01] with tripartite Diffie-Hellman (DH) protocol of Joux [Jou04]. This work was then followed by several works. Recently, Elashry, Mu and Susilo [EMS15] proposed another IBAKE protocol and introduced a new security notion called *resiliency*. A key exchange protocol is said to be *resilient* if a shared secret between parties is compromised or leaked, they are still able to generate another completely new shared secret without the need to set up a new key exchange session between the participating entities. The IBAKE protocol proposed by [EMS15] builds upon the IBE encryption scheme of [BGH07] and is proved to be resilient.

1.1. Our contribution. In this paper, we analyze the security of Elashry, Mu and Sussilo (EMS) protocol [EMS15] and prove that it has a major security flaw which renders it insecure against an impersonation attack. We are indeed able to prove that the protocol is insecure against a very simple man-in-the-middle attack. We also disprove the resiliency property of the EMS scheme by proposing a very efficient attack where an adversary can compute any share secret key from the knowledge of a single secret bit. Our method is similar to the one given in [TITN16] to attack an IBE encryption scheme proposed in [JB09].

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall the definition and notion for IBAKE protocols. In Section 3, we present Elashry, Mu, Sussilo (EMS) IBAKE protocol [EMS15]. In Section 4, we describe our attacks against EMS protocol. Finally, in Section 5 we conclude the paper.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. IBAKE Protocol. As with all other identity-based schemes, we will always assume the existence of a trusted authority which is responsible for the creation and secure distribution of users' private keys. An Identity-Based Authenticated Key Exchange protocol (IBAKE) [Sma01, MB05] is defined by three algorithms $\text{Setup}()$, $\text{Extract}()$ and $\text{KeyExchange}()$.

- (1) $(\text{msk}, \text{mpk}) \leftarrow \text{Setup}(\lambda)$. The authority takes as input a security parameter λ and generates public parameters that are denoted by mpk and a *master secret key* msk .

- (2) $\text{sk}_{\text{id}} \leftarrow \text{Extract}(\text{msk}, \text{id})$. Given an identity id , the authority uses his master key msk to generate the private key sk_{id} corresponding to id .
- (3) $\text{ssk} \leftarrow \text{KeyExchange}(\text{id}_1, \text{id}_2)$. Two parties P_1 and P_2 with system parameters $(\text{id}_1, \text{sk}_{\text{id}_1})$ and $(\text{id}_2, \text{sk}_{\text{id}_2})$ respectively generate a shared secret key ssk .

2.2. Quadratic Residues and Jacobi Symbol. For any integer $N \geq 2$ we denote by $\mathbb{Z}_N^\times$ the multiplicative group of integers modulo N . Let $y \in \mathbb{Z}_N^\times$ then we say that y is a *quadratic residue* in $\mathbb{Z}_N^\times$ if there exists $x \in \mathbb{Z}_N^\times$ such that:

$$y \equiv x^2 \pmod{N}.$$

The set of quadratic residues in $\mathbb{Z}_N^\times$ is denoted by $\text{QR}(N)$:

$$\text{QR}(N) = \{y \in \mathbb{Z}_N^\times : \exists x \in \mathbb{Z}_N^\times, y = x^2 \pmod{N}\}.$$

Let p be an odd prime number, we define the Legendre symbol of $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ with respect to p as:

$$\left(\frac{x}{p}\right) = x^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \pmod{p}.$$

We recall that $\left(\frac{x}{p}\right)$ belongs to $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ and enables to determine if x is a quadratic residue since we have:

$$\left(\frac{x}{p}\right) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in \text{QR}(N) \\ -1 & \text{if } x \notin \text{QR}(N) \text{ and } x \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p} \\ 0 & \text{if } x \equiv 0 \pmod{p}. \end{cases}$$

The Legendre symbol is extended to any odd positive integer $N = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}$ where $p_1, \dots, p_k$ are pairwise different prime numbers and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ are positive integers. This generalization is called Jacobi symbol and is defined as:

$$\left(\frac{x}{N}\right) = \left(\frac{x}{p_1}\right)^{\alpha_1} \cdots \left(\frac{x}{p_k}\right)^{\alpha_k}.$$

The subset of $\mathbb{Z}_N$ with symbol to equal 1 is denoted by $\text{J}(N)$. Note that $\text{QR}(N)$ is a subset of $\text{J}(N)$.

The *quadratic residuosity assumption* states that, for any integer $N = pq$, where p and q are different prime numbers that are picked at random, there exists no probabilistic polynomial time algorithm that is able to distinguish between the distribution of samples drawn from $\text{QR}(N)$ and the distribution of samples picked from $\text{J}(N) \setminus \text{QR}(N)$ (see [BGH07] for more details).

2.3. Solving the equation $Rx^2 + Sy^2 = 1 \pmod{N}$. Assuming that $N = pq$ where p and q are different prime numbers, Boneh, Gentry and Hamburg presented in [BGH07] an efficient algorithm to solve in $\mathbb{Z}_N$ an equation of the form:

$$Rx^2 + Sy^2 = 1 \pmod{N} \tag{1}$$

where R and S are in $\mathbb{Z}_N$. They considered the following ternary quadratic form over $\mathbb{Z}$:

$$\tilde{R}x^2 + \tilde{S}y^2 - z^2 = 0. \tag{2}$$

with $\tilde{R}, \tilde{S}$ in $\mathbb{Z}$. A classical result of Legendre [BGH07] says that (2) has a solution $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ if there exist $\tilde{r}$ and $\tilde{s}$ in $\mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\tilde{R} = \tilde{r}^2 \pmod{\tilde{S}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{S} = \tilde{s}^2 \pmod{\tilde{R}}. \quad (3)$$

Cremona and Rusin proposed in [CR03] an algorithm using lattice reduction to solve (2) assuming that (3) holds. Furthermore, if $\tilde{R} = R \pmod{N}$ and $\tilde{S} = S \pmod{N}$ then a solution to (2) also gives a solution to (1). Consequently, solving (1) consists in finding prime numbers $\tilde{R}, \tilde{S}$ and integers $\tilde{r}, \tilde{s}$ such that $\tilde{R} = R \pmod{N}$, $\tilde{S} = S \pmod{N}$ and $\tilde{r}, \tilde{s}$ satisfy (3). There exist several possible candidates $(\tilde{R}, \tilde{S})$ from a given couple (R, S) but Boneh and Franklin proposed a *deterministic* polynomial-time algorithm that finds a specific $(\tilde{R}, \tilde{S})$ which leads to a solution to (1). For more details we refer the reader to [BGH07].

Finally we state an important lemma that shows an important property that is used in [BGH07] and [EMS15].

Lemma 1. *Assume that R and S belong to $\text{QR}(N)$ and let (x, y) be a solution to (1). Then we have the following equality:*

$$\left(\frac{1 + x\sqrt{R}}{N} \right) = \left(\frac{2 + 2y\sqrt{S}}{N} \right).$$

Proof. We have in $\mathbb{Z}_N$ the following equality:

$$\begin{aligned} (x\sqrt{R} + 1) (2y\sqrt{S} + 2) &= 2xy\sqrt{RS} + 2x\sqrt{R} + 2y\sqrt{S} + 2 \\ &= (x\sqrt{R} + y\sqrt{S} + 1)^2. \end{aligned}$$

The last equality is obtained by using (1). □

3. ELASHRY-MU-SUSILO (EMS) IBAKE SCHEME

EMS scheme [EMS15] is specified by the following algorithms:

- (1) $(\text{msk}, \text{mpk}) \leftarrow \text{Setup}(\lambda)$. The authority takes as input a security parameter λ and generates two prime numbers p and q . It also selects an element $\mu \in \text{J}(N) \setminus \text{QR}(N)$ and a hash function $\mathcal{H} : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \text{J}(N)$. The master public key is then $\text{mpk} = \{N, \mu, \mathcal{H}\}$ where $N = pq$ and the master secret key is $\text{msk} = (p, q)$.
- (2) $\text{sk}_{\text{id}} \leftarrow \text{Extract}(\text{msk}, \text{id})$. Given an identity id , the authority generates $R = \mathcal{H}(\text{id})$. Since R is in $\text{J}(N)$ then either R or μR belongs to $\text{QR}(N)$. The authority chooses a in $\{0, 1\}$ such that $\mu^a R$ belongs to $\text{QR}(N)$. It then picks at random one of the four possible square roots of $\mu^a R$. We denote it by $\sqrt{\mu^a R}$. The private key for identity id is then $\text{sk}_{\text{id}} = (a, \sqrt{\mu^a R})$.

- (3) $\text{ssk} \leftarrow \text{KeyExchange}(\text{id}_1, \text{id}_2)$. Party P_1 with identity id_1 and system parameter $(R_1 = \mathcal{H}(\text{id}_1), \text{sk}_{\text{id}_1})$ chooses two random values s_1 and α_1 in $\mathbb{Z}_N^\times$ such that¹

$$\mu^{\alpha_1} R_1 \in \text{QR}.$$

P_1 then sends $(\text{id}_1, \mu^{\alpha_1}, S_1)$ to P_2 where $S_1 = s_1^2 \bmod N$ and keeps secret (α_1, s_1) .

In the same manner, P_2 with identity id_2 and system parameter $(R_2 = \mathcal{H}(\text{id}_2), \text{sk}_{\text{id}_2})$ performs the same procedure: it chooses two random values s_2 and α_2 in $\mathbb{Z}_N^\times$ such that

$$\mu^{\alpha_2} R_2 \in \text{QR}.$$

Then P_2 sends $(\text{id}_2, \mu^{\alpha_2}, S_2)$ to P_1 with $S_2 = s_2^2 \bmod N$, and keeps secret (α_2, s_2) .

Each party P_1 and P_2 computes separately $T_1 = \mu^{\alpha_1} R_1$ and $T_2 = \mu^{\alpha_2} R_2$, and solves independently for each $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ the equation:

$$T_1 S_1^{2i+1} x_i^2 + T_2 S_2^{2i+1} y_i^2 = 1 \bmod N. \quad (4)$$

From *the* solution (x_i, y_i) and its private key P_1 is then able to compute the quantity $k_{i,1} \in \{-1, 1\}$ where

$$k_{i,1} = \left(\frac{1 + x_i \sqrt{T_1} s_1^{2i+1}}{N} \right).$$

P_2 computes $k_{i,2} \in \{-1, 1\}$ from *the* solution (x_i, y_i) and its private as the following:

$$k_{i,2} = \left(\frac{2 + 2y_i \sqrt{T_2} s_2^{2i+1}}{N} \right).$$

By Lemma 1 we know that $k_{i,1} = k_{i,2}$ and therefore the shared secret key ssk is equal to:

$$\text{ssk} = (k_{1,1}, k_{1,1}, \dots, k_{\ell,1}) = (k_{1,2}, k_{1,2}, \dots, k_{\ell,2}).$$

4. CRYPTANALYSIS

4.1. Impersonation Attack. The EMS protocol displays from its definition a major security flaw: it does not prevent from parties to be impersonated by an adversary. The protocols does not ensure any authentication during the exchange. In the following we explain a simple man-in-the-middle attack against the scheme. Let us assume that an adversary $\mathcal{A}$ receives and forwards data exchanged between P_1 and P_2 whose parameters are respectively $(R_1 = \mathcal{H}(\text{id}_1), \text{sk}_{\text{id}_1})$ and $(R_2 = \mathcal{H}(\text{id}_2), \text{sk}_{\text{id}_2})$. We will now show how $\mathcal{A}$ can easily impersonate P_1 .

When P_1 sends its session identifier $(\text{id}_1, \mu^{\alpha_1}, S_1)$ to P_2 , $\mathcal{A}$ intercepts it and chooses randomly t and s in $\mathbb{Z}_N^\times$, computes $S = s^2 \bmod N$ then sends to P_2 the quantity $(\text{id}_1, \frac{t^2}{R_1}, S)$. P_2 also sends its session identifier $(\text{id}_2, \mu^{\alpha_2}, S_2)$ that is intercepted by $\mathcal{A}$. Upon receiving $(\text{id}_1, \frac{t^2}{R_1}, S)$, P_2

¹ P_1 can easily find $\alpha_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\mu^{\alpha_1} R_1 \in \text{QR}$ and can even compute $\sqrt{\mu^{\alpha_1} R_1}$ from its private key $\text{sk}_{\text{id}_1} = (a_1, \sqrt{\mu^{a_1} R_1})$. Indeed, P_1 chooses α_1 to be equal to $2t + a_1$ for a random integer $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ so that

$$\mu^{\alpha_1} R_1 = \mu^{2t+a_1} R_1 = \left(\mu^t \sqrt{\mu^{a_1} R_1} \right)^2.$$

computes first $T = \frac{t^2}{R_1} R_1 \bmod N$ which turns out to be $t^2 \bmod N$. Therefore $\mathcal{A}$ and P_2 have both to solve for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ the (common) equations:

$$TS^{2i+1}x^2 + T_2S_2^{2i+1}y^2 = 1.$$

Then $\mathcal{A}$ and P_2 share the same secret key $\text{ssk} = (k_1, \dots, k_\ell)$ since for any $i \geq 1$:

$$k_i = \left(\frac{1 + x_i t s^{2i+1}}{N} \right) = \left(\frac{2 + 2y_i \sqrt{T_2} s_2^{2i+1}}{N} \right).$$

The main reason why this attack is possible comes from the fact that each party in the protocol perform computations without involving data that identify the correspondent. Hence EMS protocol does not satisfy the basic property of authentication that any AKE protocol must satisfy. In the next session, we analyze further the security of the protocol by showing that EMS does not even ensure the resiliency property [EMS15].

4.2. Attack Against the Resiliency Property. We assume that two parties P_1 and P_2 managed to share a secret key $\text{ssk} = (k_1, \dots, k_\ell)$ by means of EMS protocol as described in Section 3. We will prove in the sequel that if an attacker $\mathcal{A}$ only knows one bit, let us say k_i with $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, then he is able to recompute any bit k_j with $j \neq i$. This proves that EMS protocol does not satisfy the resiliency property unlike what is claimed by the authors in [EMS15]. But before presenting our attack, we need an important lemma.

Lemma 2. [BGH07, Lemma 5.1] *For i in $\{1, 2\}$ let (x_i, y_i) be a solution to*

$$Ax^2 + B_i y^2 = 1 \bmod N$$

where $Ax_1x_2 + 1$ belongs to $\mathbb{Z}_N^\times$. Then (x_3, y_3) is a solution to

$$Ax^2 + B_1B_2y^2 = 1 \bmod N$$

where x_3 and y_3 are in $\mathbb{Z}_N^\times$ and satisfy

$$x_3 = \frac{x_1 + x_2}{1 + Ax_1x_2} \text{ and } y_3 = \frac{y_1y_2}{1 + Ax_1x_2}.$$

We now describe how an adversary $\mathcal{A}$ can break the EMS protocol if $\mathcal{A}$ only knows k_i for some $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ from a shared key $(k_1, \dots, k_\ell)$. For the sake of simplicity, we will only describe how $\mathcal{A}$ can recover k_{i+1} from k_i and data publicly exchanged by P_1 and P_2 . By induction, the attack can be generalized to any bit k_j .

Firstly, $\mathcal{A}$ solves (4) for i and $i + 1$ to get (x_i, y_i) and (x_{i+1}, y_{i+1}) such that:

$$\begin{cases} T_1S_1^{2i+1}x_i^2 + T_2S_2^{2i+1}y_i^2 = 1 \\ T_1S_1^{2i+3}x_{i+1}^2 + T_2S_2^{2i+3}y_{i+1}^2 = 1. \end{cases}$$

As explained in Section 2.3, $\mathcal{A}$ gets the *same* solutions to these equations as P_1 and P_2 would have during the protocol. Furthermore, $\mathcal{A}$ knows (S_1x_{i+1}, y_{i+1}) which is a solution to the following equation:

$$T_1S_1^{2i+1}(S_1x_{i+1})^2 + T_2S_2^{2i+3}y_{i+1}^2 = 1$$

From solutions (x_i, y_i) and $(S_1 x_{i+1}, y_{i+1})$, the adversary $\mathcal{A}$, by using Lemma 2, derives (x_*, y_*) that is solution to the equation

$$T_1 S_1^{2i+1} x_*^2 + T_2^2 S_2^{4i+4} y_*^2 = 1 \quad (5)$$

where

$$x_* = \frac{x_i + S_1 x_{i+1}}{1 + T_1 S_1^{2i+2} x_i x_{i+1}} \text{ and } y_* = \frac{y_i y_{i+1}}{1 + T_1 S_1^{2i+2} x_i x_{i+1}}.$$

The next lemma proves that k_i and k_{i+1} are related and an adversary can easily compute k_{i+1} from k_i and y_* and the public data exchanged between P_1 and P_2 .

Lemma 3. *Let (x_*, y_*) be the solution to (5). We then have the equality:*

$$k_{i+1} = k_i \cdot \left(\frac{1 + T_1 S_1^{2i+2} x_i x_{i+1}}{N} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{2 + 2y_* T_2 S_2^{2i+2}}{N} \right)$$

Proof. We start by observing that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + x_* \sqrt{T_1 S_1^{2i+1}} &= 1 + x_* \sqrt{T_1} s_1^{2i+1} \\ &= 1 + \frac{(x_i + S_1 x_{i+1})}{1 + T_1 S_1^{2i+2} x_i x_{i+1}} \sqrt{T_1} s_1^{2i+1} \\ &= \frac{1 + T_1 S_1^{2i+2} x_i x_{i+1} + x_i \sqrt{T_1} s_1^{2i+1} + x_{i+1} \sqrt{T_1} s_1^{2i+3}}{1 + T_1 S_1^{2i+2} x_i x_{i+1}} \\ &= \frac{(1 + x_i \sqrt{T_1} s_1^{2i+1}) (1 + x_{i+1} \sqrt{T_1} s_1^{2i+3})}{1 + T_1 S_1^{2i+2} x_i x_{i+1}} \end{aligned}$$

Since $k_i = \left(\frac{1 + x_i \sqrt{T_1} s_1^{2i+1}}{N} \right)$ and $k_{i+1} = \left(\frac{1 + x_{i+1} \sqrt{T_1} s_1^{2i+3}}{N} \right)$, this implies in particular that:

$$k_{i+1} = k_i \cdot \left(\frac{1 + T_1 S_1^{2i+2} x_i x_{i+1}}{N} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1 + x_* \sqrt{T_1} s_1^{2i+1}}{N} \right)$$

By Lemma 1 we also have that:

$$\left(\frac{2 + 2y_* T_2 S_2^{2i+2}}{N} \right) = \left(\frac{1 + x_* \sqrt{T_1} s_1^{2i+1}}{N} \right)$$

which terminates the proof of the lemma. $\square$

5. CONCLUSION

We presented in this paper a very efficient way to attack EMS protocol [EMS15]. Our work proves that unlike what is claimed by the authors, the protocol does not satisfy the so-called resiliency property. This security notion was introduced in [EMS15] to describe the property of AKE protocols that are still able to generate a new secret key even if some secret bits are leaked in the past. We show that EMS protocol is vulnerable to a simple man-in-the-middle attack. Furthermore, we propose an attack where an adversary is able to compute any bit of a shared key if he only knows one secret bit.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A. Otmani is funded by ANR grant ANR-15-CE39-0013-01 MANTA.

REFERENCES

- [BB04] Dan Boneh and Xavier Boyen. Efficient selective-id secure identity-based encryption without random oracles. In Christian Cachin and Jan L. Camenisch, editors, *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2004: International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, Inter-laken, Switzerland, May 2-6, 2004. Proceedings*, pages 223–238, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [BF01] Dan Boneh and Matt Franklin. Identity-based encryption from the weil pairing. In Joe Kilian, editor, *Advances in Cryptology — CRYPTO 2001: 21st Annual International Cryptology Conference, Santa Barbara, California, USA, August 19–23, 2001 Proceedings*, pages 213–229, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2001. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [BGH07] Dan Boneh, Craig Gentry, and Michael Hamburg. Space-efficient identity based encryption without pairings. *2007 48th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 00:647–657, 2007.
- [Coc01] Clifford Cocks. An identity based encryption scheme based on quadratic residues. In *Proceedings of the 8th IMA International Conference on Cryptography and Coding*, pages 360–363, London, UK, UK, 2001. Springer-Verlag.
- [CR03] John Cremona and David Rusin. Efficient solution of rational conics. *Mathematics of Computation*, 72(243):1417–1441, 2003.
- [DH76] W. Diffie and M. Hellman. New directions in cryptography. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theor.*, 22(6):644–654, September 1976.
- [EMS15] Ibrahim Elashry, Yi Mu, and Willy Susilo. A resilient identity-based authenticated key exchange protocol. *Security and Communication Networks*, 8(13):2279–2290, 2015. sec.1172.
- [GPV08] Craig Gentry, Chris Peikert, and Vinod Vaikuntanathan. Trapdoors for hard lattices and new cryptographic constructions. In *Proceedings of the Fortieth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC '08*, pages 197–206, New York, NY, USA, 2008. ACM.
- [JB09] Mahabir Prasad Jhanwar and Rana Barua. A variant of boneh-gentry-hamburg’s pairing-free identity based encryption scheme. In Moti Yung, Peng Liu, and Dongdai Lin, editors, *Information Security and Cryptology: 4th International Conference, Inscrypt 2008, Beijing, China, December 14-17, 2008, Revised Selected Papers*, pages 314–331, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [Jou04] Antoine Joux. A one round protocol for tripartite diffie–hellman. *Journal of Cryptology*, 17(4):263–276, 2004.
- [MB05] Noel McCullagh and Paulo S. L. M. Barreto. A new two-party identity-based authenticated key agreement. In Alfred Menezes, editor, *Topics in Cryptology – CT-RSA 2005: The Cryptographers’ Track at the RSA Conference 2005, San Francisco, CA, USA, February 14-18, 2005. Proceedings*, pages 262–274, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [Sha85] Adi Shamir. Identity-based cryptosystems and signature schemes. In *Proceedings of CRYPTO 84 on Advances in Cryptology*, volume 196, pages 47–53, New York, NY, USA, 1985. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc.
- [Sma01] N. P. Smart. An identity based authenticated key agreement protocol based on the weil pairing. *Electronics Letters*, 38:630–632, 2001.
- [ȚITN16] Ferucio LaurenȚiu Țiplea, Sorin Iftene, George Teșeleanu, and Anca-Maria Nica. Security of identity-based encryption schemes from quadratic residues. In Ion Bica and Reza Reyhanitabar, editors, *Innovative Security Solutions for Information Technology and Communications: 9th International Conference, SECITC 2016, Bucharest, Romania, June 9-10, 2016, Revised Selected Papers*, pages 63–77, Cham, 2016. Springer International Publishing.

- [Wat05] Brent Waters. Efficient identity-based encryption without random oracles. In Ronald Cramer, editor, *Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT 2005: 24th Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, Aarhus, Denmark, May 22-26, 2005. Proceedings*, pages 114–127, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.